COMMANDERS DIGEST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE • WASHINGTON, D.C.

Vol. 7, No. 11 December 13, 1969

Governors' Conference

President Nixon Stresses Information, Education To Fight Drug Abuse

President Nixon told a special meeting of the nation's governors Dec. 3 that drug abuse must be combatted through a nationwide information and education program.

Mr. Nixon, who had invited the governors, their wives and children to the meeting, said that when drug addiction becomes a "national malady" the spirit of the nation may be impaired.

In combatting drug abuse, the President said, part of the process includes criminal penalties. "But when you get to the point that you have to apply criminal penalties to the users and dispensers of drugs, then the damage has already been done."

He told the governors he had invited them to the Conference on Narcotics and Drug Abuse following a series of studies and meetings he had held on drugs.

Other speakers at the conference included Vice President Spiro Agnew; Robert H. Finch, secretary of Health, Education and Welfare; and Daniel P. Moynihan, counsellor to the President.

Following are excerpts from their remarks:

President Nixon:

This conference is an unusual one, as you have heard, because not only are the Governors in attendance, but their wives and their families.

I would like to tell you how this conference came about. We had a presentation in the Cabinet, which I think those present agreed, was one of the most impressive and certainly one that had greater affect on our thinking than any that we have had.

We had the same presentation for Members of Congress. I happened to sit by Speaker (John) McCormack that day on the one side, and (Senator) Mike Mansfield, the Democratic Leader, on the other side. Each individually told me that in all of the years they have attended bipartisan conferences at the White House, that presentation on narcotics and dangerous drugs was the most effective that they had ever heard.

For this reason, the fact that this presentation had been so effective, before the Cabinet and before the legislative Leaders, we thought it also should be made to the Governors. It should be made to you also because if we are to do what needs to be done, we not only have to do it at the Federal level, we need of course, State cooperation, city cooperation, county cooperation, Government volunteer activities at all levels.

Now the presentation itself will cover in more specific terms the general points I would like to make.

First, with regard to the magnitude of the program, and I am going to use statistics that are deliberately cautious but which certainly can be sustained by any reasonable objective observance, the number of people in the United States who use marijuana is 8 million. The number of people who use heroin—and when they use it, that means they will not be able to get off its use—is 180,000.

But now putting it in another dimension, the number of people of college age who use marijuana, or have used it, is one-third of all the college students of the Nation. The number of students of high school age who have used marijuana is 16 percent.

Now let's look at where those various groups break down. There has been sort of a general thought that so far as drugs

(Continued on Page 2)

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
DOCUMENT RECEIVED DIVISION

President Urges Information, Education to Help Combat Drug Abuse

(Continued from Page 1)

were concerned, we find them in the ghettos, among the deprived, those who are depressed and turn to drugs as a last resort. That may have once been the case. It is not the case today.

The prime concern, as far as drugs, has moved to the upper middle class, those families who have better opportunities than others who have less of this world's goods. Consequently, we see that the problem is not limited to any region of the country or any segment of the society. It hits the young as well as the old and is indeed a national problem.

Now, what is its effect? Here we get some arguments. There are those who say marijauna has perhaps as little effect as alcohol has, and that all depends on the quantity in either case. There are others who point out that when we start with marijuana, then the inevitable result is to move on to LSD or whatever provides the bigger thrill, until eventually the individual moves to heroin, or the so-called hard narcotics, from which there is no recovery. But we do know, from hard statistics. I notice that Mayor (Walter) Washington is here from Washington, D. C., who has major responsibilities. We were talking about the problem of robberies in the city the other day, and it is interesting to note that over half of the robberies in the city are committed by people who are addicted to drugs, which indicates either cause or effect, or both. Whether one leads to the other or vice versa is not really material to the point. There is a direct relationship in one way or the other.

We can also go further in terms of that effect. In the City of New York alone, I was looking at some statistics that were presented by Mr. (Daniel P.) Moynihan, and in one week 100 people died in the City of New York because of over doses of drugs, heroin or some other types. That is an indication of what drugs can do.

But let's put it in another broader, more important, dimension. When we look to the history of civilization we find that those civilizations that have turned on a broad, general basis to drugs, and particularly when that affliction reaches the leader classes of those civilizations, those civilizations inevitably lose their spirit. They go down. They are destroyed. This is what happened.

The question is, is it going to happen to America? We have many problems in this country — material problems, problems we will deal with in this conference when we meet again in February, and which we will deal with in Washington, and you will deal with in your State capital, problems of the environment and other problems that can be dealt with in a material way. But when the spirit of the people is destroyed, it is almost impossible to restore that spirit.

There is not any question but that when drug addiction becomes a national malady, affecting all segments of the population, that there is the danger that the spirit of a nation may certainly be impaired.

These are some of the factors we have to have in mind.

Shortly after my nomination last year, I received a number of letters as you might imagine. I received one that was unsigned, by a girl in San Diego, who said she was 19 years of age. She told me her story. She came from a good family. She went to Sunday School and church as a little girl. She started on marijuana and then went to LSD, and she was now hooked on heroin.

She was in some hospital for whatever therapy could be provided in order to restore her to some degree of health.

It was a letter which moved me emotionally, as it would have moved anyone here. The concluding paragraph of that letter was this: She said: Mr. Nixon, I think you are going to be elected. If you are, as President, will you try to do something to see that what happened to me does not happen to other young people across this country.

I am going to keep my promise to that young girl, and I want all of you to help me keep that promise, not because I personally have a stake in it, in the sense of politics, just as you personally would not think in those terms, but because we have a national responsibility—a national responsibility to all of the young people of this Nation to see to it that they have a chance to grow up, to grow up without having their spirit destroyed and their health destroyed by turning to drugs.

Then I would add this final point. I have learned a lot in these presentations. I must say that when they first started, I thought the answer was more penalties. I thought that the answer was simply enforce the law and that will stop people from the use of drugs. But it is not that.

When you are talking about 13 year-olds and 14 year-olds and 15 year-olds, the answer is not more penalties. The answer is information. The answer is understanding.

It is very important to be quite precise, to distinguish between marijuana and LSD and heroin, so that we can all know what the effect of each is and so that we will be able to make the case against each, if the case is to be made against each on the facts as they are, rather than on the facts as we thought they were before we received the knowledge which we are going to receive in this briefing today.

We are glad that all of you are here, the Governors, their wives, and particularly their children, so that we can get the facts, and so that all of us can go back to our communities and be able to wage a campaign—a campaign of information and education that will reach all of the people in the States of this Nation, because that campaign of education and information, in my opinion, is probably more important than the criminal penalties that we will be talking about later in this session today.

That is part of the process. But when you get to the point that you have to apply criminal penalties to the users and dispensers of drugs, then the damage has already been done. What we are trying to do is get at it before that point. We ask your assistance in that.

Now the presentation will go on, and you should ask yourself whether you agree with the Congressmen and the Cabinet and the Senators about the importance of this conference, and whether you think, in your judgment, this trip to Washington for the Governors and their families was worthwhile.

President Nixon and Vice President Agnew confer during Governors' Conference on Narcotics and Drugs.

Vice President Agnew:

'Freedom Of Speech Is Useless Without Freedom Of Thought'

It has frequently been stated that the strength of a nation depends upon the strength of its people. But people are not born strong. A young person draws his strength from the teaching and example of those closest to him. In most cases, this means the family. So it would not be inaccurate to say that the strength of a nation depends upon the strength of its families.

The President of the United States is a family man. Because he is, and because he believes you are family-oriented, we are here today—as the French say, "*en famille.*"

Since so many of you have brought your youngsters with you, today I would like to talk about young people, about the silent majority and the vocal minority of youth. I would like to discuss shallow demonstrations and profound demonstrations, and a way for men and women of good will, and of all ages, to begin to bridge the generation gap.

For some time now, I have been speaking out against the cause that some people have been demonstrating about. As a result, I have been charged with being "against the right to demonstrate."

For some time now, I have been reminding parents and young people alike that self-respect begins with mutual respect, and that order in society begins with discipline and authority in the home. As a result, I have been charged with being "against young people."

(I've also made a couple of speeches about the media, but nobody paid any attention to those.)

Now, anybody who knows me, or has taken the trouble to read what I have to say, knows that I respect the right of dissent in America, and knows that I admire and respect the great majority of young people in America today.

But the fact of the charges illustrates a phenomenon of our times. Too many of us are unwilling to argue a point but are too willing to point at an arguer. Too many of us stand ready to evade a debate by challenging the motives of the debater. Why bother to come to grips with a real issue, they ask, when a strawman of your own offers such an inviting target?

That kind of evasion results in "ricochet rhetoric"—when people do not respond to what is said, but to what other people say you meant. There is nothing wrong with joining an issue, but there is something very definitely wrong in two sides deliberately missing each other's point.

That is why there is so little real communication between those who demonstrate and those who are the targets of demonstration. That is why what should be a "meaningful dialogue" has become all too often a cacophony of meaningless monologues. That refusal to approach an issue with an open mind, that refusal to entertain a spirit of compromise —that is what is building barriers between the young and the not-so-young, between an outspoken minority and a soft-spoken majority. That is the barrier we must begin to dismantle—from both sides.

Freedom of speech is useless without freedom of thought. And I fear that the politics of protest is shutting out the process of thought, so necessary to rational discussion. We are faced with the Ten Commandments of Protest:

Thou Shalt Not Allow Thy Opponent to Speak.

Thou Shalt Not Set Forth a Program of Thine Own.

Thou Shalt Not Trust Anybody Over Thirty.

Thou Shalt Not Honor Thy Father or Thy Mother.

Thou Shalt Not Heed the Lessons of History.

Thou Shalt Not Write Anything Longer than a Slogan.

Thou Shalt Not Present a Negotiable Demand.

Thou Shalt Not Accept Any Establishment Idea.

Thou Shalt Not Revere Any but Totalitarian Heroes.

Thou Shalt Not Ask Forgiveness for Thy Transgressions, Rather Thou Shalt Demand Amnesty for Them.

In the face of these Commandments of Protest, how do we establish communication? How do we reach out without caving in? How do we talk *to* each other instead of just *at* each other?

Fortunately, the true believers in these Commandments are

(Continued on Next Page)

(Continued from Preceding Page)

relatively few. And fortunately, we have an Administration in this country ready to listen to the legitimate needs of the young, and even more important, ready and able to respond to those needs in significant ways.

You have already seen this morning how we are tackling the problem of dangerous drugs, which are more of a threat to our young people than any other segment of the population. And right across town this week, a White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health is taking place; this Administration has thereby provided a forum and a focal point for constructive controversy on a subject of deep concern to millions of our committed young people.

To a young person's question, "What have you done for us lately?" the obvious answer is "reform the draft." Certainly this long-overdue reform ends the terrible uncertainty that hung over millions of young lives. By and large, most young people of draft age can now make plans for their lives with a big question mark removed. And now that the President has demonstrated his credibility in this area, I think most young people believe he means what he says about an all-volunteer army in the future, and an end to the draft.

But let us look beyond the issues of immediate concern to young people, and look into the events of the past month that may affect their lives for years to come.

—We have signed a treaty that limits the spread of nuclear weapons, and reduces to some degree the threat of holocaust to future generations. The diplomatic negotiatons that led to this signing are for historians of the future to detail, but there was far more to the signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty than the stroke of a pen.

—We have announced our intention to return Okinawa to Japan, in a generous rather than a grudging spirit, thereby laying the basis for a harmonious long-term relationship with the third most important industrial nation in the world, and increasing the chances for stability in the Far East in the generations to come.

—We have unilaterally renounced the use of germ warfare, and by setting this example to the world, we have added to the environment of peaceful negotiation as we lessen the terror of war to future generations.

—We have begun Strategic Arms Limitation Talks with the Soviet Union, and the depth and extent of our preparation for these talks cannot help but impress the other side of the table with our seriousness of purpose. And on the outcome of these negotiations hang so many of the hopes of tomorrow's generation of Americans.

Consider for a moment what those four acts last month mean to young people in America: The NPT, the return of Okinawa, the renunciation of germ warfare, the opening of the SALT talks.

I believe that when future historians look at the month of November, 1969, they will not consider it to be the month of the March or the month of the Moratorium. I believe they will consider November, 1969, to be a turning point in the history of the 20th Century—a month in which President Nixon led the way toward world peace.

Since I mentioned the demonstration of last month, let me address myself to the focal point of the protest of so many of our young people: Why are we Vietnamizing the war in an orderly way—why don't we just pull out right now?

Here is the straight answer: We are being steadfast in Vietnam because we do not want the next generation of Americans to have to fight another war. If America were to cut and run, we would be cutting the chance for peace in the Seventies, and running out on the children in school today who would have to fight a war tomorrow.

This generation is charged with the responsibility of dealing with the real world, with life as it is. The power and pressure and suspicion of the real world cannot be dispelled by wishful thinking, or by turning inward, or by doubting our ideals, or by blaming ourselves for all the ills of mankind.

By following the path of appeasement, this generation could accomplish "peace in *our* time." But we say to the next generation—"We are just as much concerned with peace in *your* time." We refuse to accept a solution that says "Peace Now—Pay Later." Because it is our children—the younger generation—who would have to pay later the price of surrender now.

More than anything else, the desire to transmit a better and a safer world to the next generation motivates the men at the center of decision today.

Why are we overhauling our welfare system—if not to build a better life for children who would otherwise be doomed to lives of poverty?

Why are we taxing ourselves at the highest rate in America's history—if not to avoid the deficits that would bankrupt the next generation?

Why are we turning the flow of power away from Washington and back toward the States—if not to enable the adults of tomorrow to have a greater say in managing their own destinies?

This is our way of "demonstrating." This is our demonstration of good faith toward the young Americans who are far more the objects of our hopes than our fears.

In this demonstration, the only signs we carry are the signs of the times—the hard evidence of action, the deeds you can see and the reform you can feel.

And the march we are most interested in is the march of progress—the progress that comes from respect for each other, respect for our free institutions, respect for new ideas.

I believe that we will see young people tomorrow dedicating themselves more profoundly than by the simple drama of demonstration. I believe we will see them involving themselves in community action against pollution—organizing clean-up brigades, buttonholing civic and political leaders, pressing their cause with cogent argument, and mobilizing support by the power of their example. By working within the system, they can change the system.

Why do I believe this? Because sooner or later, you face the choice in life between getting something off your chest and getting something *done*. That's the choice that determines maturity.

I think the vast majority of the young activists in America are mature enough to want to get something done. In that cause—as in every positive cause—they will find an Administration, and an older generation, with them all the way.

Secretary Finch

HEW Gives Priority to Drug Study; New Efforts to Inform, Educate

I think we are seeing a twisted, distorted reflection of the images the young people have taken in in those formative years from TV and the other media, and perhaps all too often, I fear, from their observation of adult society.

I think we are seeing the end product of a pill culture, the total environment in which the desired result can be achieved by taking a couple of these or one of those or a spoonful of whatever.

This is the context in which I ask you to listen to my remarks this morning. I doubt that we will end up with hard answers, but I do hope we can open our minds and pose the really hard questions.

There are some basic propositions where there is no room for debate. The traffic in drugs from marijuana up to the hardest of narcotics is a matter of the greatest consequences, and my Department supports every law enforcement agency, Federal and State and local.

Within the framework of the Administration's proposal for the control of dangerous substances, we will continue to supply the scientific backup for the rigorous classification of drugs, and a rational schedule of penalties appropriate to each.

There is not an either-or proposition. Soundly-based, tough, equitable laws, and law enforcement, is one side of the coin, but the other goes beyond law enforcement to causes and cures and prevention and treatment and rehabilitation. These are the areas which we are involved with in HEW.

These really come down to three major, basic components —fundamental research, treatment and rehabilitation, and public information and education in the broadest possible sense.

If I brush over lightly on the first two of these components, it is a reflection that, relatively speaking, these are the two that have received most of the attention in the past, and I think are most nearly at hand. But let me emphasize this point—they underlie and establish the foundations for all we are doing, and all we intend to do.

Under contract with our National Institute of Mental Health, at HEW, we have, for the first time, isolated the essential element of marijuana. It has now been synthesized. And this is a major breakthrough. It is called THC, and with the use of radioisotopes, we can begin to trace the effects of marijuana through all the human organisms for the first time, really, in our history, because there is this enormous disparity between the soft leaf of Southwest America and the harder leaf of the Mideast, for example.

But there are other widespread fictions that marijuana is really harmless. As the President suggested, in some areas, it is no more dangerous than alcohol. The fact is, we just don't know, but with synthesized THC, we will begin to find out, and this has a top priority research undertaking.

We will continue this same kind of stringent research in all drug areas. That is one string in our bow. Another, directly related, covers the area of treatment and rehabilitation.

Our effort here has been based in the Clinical Research Centers at Lexington and Fort Worth, on the development of effective modes of treatment and rehabilitation. In just the last few years, this experience and expertise has begun to be translated into community based facilities across the Nation.

This will constitute the thrust of our efforts from now on, to assist the States, the counties, the localities, to establish accessible centers for comprehensive treatment of drug users,

(Continued on Next Page)

COMMANDERS DIGEST

THIS PUBLICATION CONTAINS OFFICIAL INFORMATION, NEWS AND POLICY, DIRECT FROM WASHINGTON AUTHORIZED SOURCES.

Published weekly by American Forces Press Service, 1117 N. 19th St., Arlington, Va. 22209, a unified activity of the Office of Information for the Armed Forces, OASD (M&RA). Reproduction of content is authorized. Suggested dateline for materials used is WASHINGTON (AFPS).

(Continued from Preceding Page)

and for their re-entry into the community as productive citizens.

We now have 16 community centers in operation, or close to it, and 18 currently in process. We look to more than 100 aftercare facilities now in operation, to provide one-time drug abusers with essential, continuing services. The theme that runs through all these efforts is to remove drug abuse from the county jail, even as, at Lexington, the bars have come down, and we don't have a prison-like atmosphere. We are trying to treat the drug victim as a salvageable human being, and as a curable patient.

The best medicine in this, as in every facet of human health, is preventive medicine. And this leads me to the final component of our efforts at HEW; this is the public information and public education, in the very broadest sense of these terms.

We are using the medium—radio, television, film, billboards, posters, public print. It involves the classroom, the school house, the college campus, and even the preschool day care center. It involves peer group interactions. The fact is, the educational experience involves every medium and every vehicle for the transmission of facts, attitudes, values, indeed life style.

So it is this entire life experience that we are trying to direct ourselves to.

We are developing plans for a wholly new teaching discipline, the health teacher, because as most of us know—those of you who are Governors at least—when we were in high school we had a district nurse, and that has almost disappeared from the scene. We think this health teacher could serve as a basic resource person for a school or school system, to help inculcate habits of good health into school children, from the earliest grades—how to brush their teeth properly. There is a dye that you can put on your gums and teeth now and if the child gets that off after doing it about a month and a half, he will brush his teeth properly the rest of his life.

Think of the dollars we would save in medicare and medicaid, Mr. President.

It is simple hygiene, but most of all, information about drugs, about every substance that might be introduced into the body, to get the child thinking that anything he puts in his mouth could have a deleterious effect.

In all of these varied efforts, there is one new organization that I want to mention. Art Linkletter has been working with them. It is a privately sponsored clearing house for some 70 participating organizations—practically every major volunteer organization in the country. Its name is the National Coordinating Council on Drug Abuse Education and Information.

It has no axe to grind; it doesn't push specific policies, except that any effective assault on drug abuse must be grounded in accessible and authoritative fact, and that widely tested experience must be widely shared.

Now this organization is going to come to you, as Governors, and ask you to set up auxiliary groups in each of your States, and they will be in touch with you and I can only commend this as being of the highest importance and I hope you will respond.

A few weeks ago, a warning came home to the students of Amherst College. A visiting Harvard undergraduate went on a "bad trip" with LSD on a recent weekend—a fatal trip. He fell 70 feet from a dormitory roof to his death.

Then the Dean of Amherst, Robert Ward, addressed a letter to the entire student body. I think he was addressing it to all of us. He said:

I did not become a dean to watch a generation of students pollute their sanity or distort their lives, and I confess to a numbing sense of helplessness.

He said: I can see no wisdom at all in this use of drugs. I see a danger that one major tragedy obscures others. On a beautiful fall afternoon that was in itself a natural stimulant, why did someone have to turn to an uncertain drug? Why do we tolerate in our midst the profiteers of poison? By what moral right do we pass into the hands of others substances that can threaten the well-being of our children's lives? What in God's name is happening to us?

Now that is the right question. We are all seeking the right answers. I know that is what motivates my Department and what motivates all of you here today.

Mr. Moynihan

Explains Need For Social Control To Check Chemical Environment

Let me offer one general idea. Drug use—and abuse—represents simply one more instance of the impact of technology on society. This is the central experience of modern society. At one or two removes, most of the ills we suffer are the consequences of technology. That is to say, the bad results that accompany the good ones—good results which led to the adoption of the technology in the first place. A commonplace observation, but truly an important one, and one which will I think be recognized by Governors who struggle daily with waters polluted by technology, underprivileged populations displaced by technology, drivers and pedestrians maimed by technology, cities choked with technology, and air fouled by it. Not to mention urban populations near to terrorized by crime brought about by the need to obtain money to purchase certain drugs which are yet another product of technology. From nuclear weapons to cyclamates, this is what is so unsettling about modern life. The effort to master and somehow transcend technology is central to the concerns of the great philosophical historians and sociologists of the age, men such as Jacques Ellul, Lewis Mumford, David Riesman, Michael Young. But for the moment one of the tasks of government is to keep technology from rending the fabric of society.

Let there be no mistaking the fact. There is a drug problem in America today. We are using too many chemical substances. We are suffering from an onslaught of the chemical environment that has no precedent in our history. If it continues unchecked we are likely to do not only our persons but our culture serious, even grievous harm. Somehow we have got to get the use of chemical substances back under social control. Or perhaps one should simply say we should develop such a social control, for really we have never had such. Technology has created a new situation to which we must find an effective response.

There are those who will and do propose a social policy of complete and free availability of almost all chemical substances that are or can be ingested in one form or another. In its most popular form today, this takes the form of advocating the free use of cannabis, and somewhat less frequently, the free, or mildly regulated use of heroin. I believe this to be a very mistaken position. It is a form of hiding behind the principle of individual freedom to avoid the reality of individual danger and individual harm. It is almost a form of indifference to pain; and I say that in full knowledge of the generosity of spirit and the effort to be understanding that often motivates such proposals.

Our object must be higher. We must learn to use fewer drugs, not more.

The question of course is how?

One of the reasons there is such widespread support for the free use of drugs, and such great skepticism about ever reducing that use, is that America lives with the heritage of the social disaster brought on by the effort to prevent the use of alcohol.

Prohibition was perhaps the greatest social experiment we have undertaken. Certainly it was our greatest disaster. As a student of urban affairs it would be my view that the American city has still not recovered from the utter delegitimation of authority which was brought about by the wholesale, public violation of the Volstead Act. Owing primarily to prohibition, city government in America became utterly corrupted during the 1920's, and everyone knew it. Its reputation, its honor, its dignity really have not yet recovered.

Nor has the aftermath of prohibition been especially attractive.

Prohibition created organized crime, which city, state and national administrations have striven in vain to bring under control for what is almost three generations.

Prohibition also, as best one can tell, created a drinking ethic which now suffuses the American culture. In New York City, for example, 15,000 saloons were replaced by 32,000 speakeasies. Drinking became de rigueur, and later it became for all too many a source of dependency, if not actual addiction. In 1960, some 4.5 million Americans suffered from the disease of alcoholism. In 1964, the F.B.I. reported some 1,458,821 arrests for public drunkeness. This accounted for over 31 percent of the total arrests for all offenses, and is almost twice the number of arrests for index crime offenses. If alcohol-related arrests are taken into account (such as driving under the influence of alcohol, disorderly conduct and vagrancy) alcohol abuse probably accounts for about half the arrests that take place in America each year. (And, as you know, the question of whether persons with the disease of alcoholism can or ought to be punished by law is very much before the courts. If you would have a measure of its incidence, you might consider on the way home today that about one oncoming car in ten is driven by an alcoholic.)

We were not able to prevent the use of alcohol, and we have not been able to bring it under social control for millions of our people. This seems to me to be a fact to be reckoned with. I am always impressed when I come upon a problem which others have tried to solve and have failed to solve, particularly when this has involved government efforts. I prefer not to assume that the others were simply stupid, or venal, or uninterested. I prefer to assume it is a tough problem.

So also, obviously, is the problem of drug use. We have had drug prohibition for fifty-five years now. And here we are at this conference. Not exactly a record of success.

What are we to learn? The first thing, obviously, is that this is not an easy problem. Men as good as us or better have struggled, and by all outward indices, they have failed. It could be things would be even worse but I doubt that. In the course of the 1960's the size of the drug using population expanded enormously and changed very considerably in its social character. Rather as did drinking during the 1920's, drug use became respectable during the 1960's. The present pattern of drug use very much seems to resemble the pattern of alcohol use. Alcohol use is greatest among well-educated younger males. Alcohol abuse (alcoholism, problem drinking,

involved or escapist drinking) is centered in poor metropolitan populations, particularly in older males, persons who are divorced or badly educated, with low occupational status. There are some social variants. Fundamentalists and Catholics are overrepresented among persons who are alcoholics. I would imagine persons of Latin extraction might have a higher use of drugs such as marijuana, following the same pattern of cultural inheritance.

That is about all we know, however. Which is to say that we know drugs do more damage to some groups than they do to others, and more to some individuals than to other individuals. Just as does alcohol.

New legislation is needed, and we have proposed such legislation. A uniform state regulation is needed, and this is now available in the form of the Uniform State Controlled Dangerous Substances Act. And above all we need knowledge. Dr. Norman Zinberg has, it seems to me, most helpfully described the drug phenomenon in terms of a triangle of "Drug, Set, and Setting." That is to say we need to know so much more about the interaction of a particular chemical, a particular individual, and the social (or anti-social) context in which the two come together. This is very like the epidemiological triad, and deserves the most careful attention and serious research. Until very recently most drug users have been treated in terms of medical or criminal categories. Drug users were treated as deviants. Benignly so in the case of the Civil War opium addicts swilling away at patent medicines to cure what was known as "soldiers illness," or punitively so as in the case of the heroin addict of the slum, supporting his habit by thievery or worse, and in agonizing numbers ending his life by what society prefers to diagnose as an "overdose" of whatever it is that ailed him. Drug use has broken out of that deviant structure, much as did alcohol use. David Riesman has pointed out how frequently it serves as a "boundary breaking" agent—boundaries, that is, between social class and race, and of course the ever present boundary of sex. Young Americans are much involved in boundary breaking, and are likely to continue to be. We must accordingly expect them to continue to be much involved with drugs. Unless we provide an alternative.

That, it seems to me is the point. Educating the public, particularly the young, to the nature and danger of drug use is first and fundamental. Restricting the supply of drugs, and where appropriate, enforcing the laws against their use, is next.

Whatever we do, let us not corrupt our police and courts and political system in the process of enforcing our laws. (And let us be candid. It is entirely evident that the heroin traffic has involved municipal corruption. Moreover, that corruption apparently, for a period, made its way into the ranks of Federal narcotics agents.) Nor, just as seriously, having become aroused by this problem because it has appeared among the children of the upper middle class, let us not continue to ignore the far more desperate reality of drug use among the poor. If I were to be asked for an example of moral corruption in American society during the 1950's and 1960's—a failure more accurately of moral sensibilities—I do not think I could cite a better example than the near to absolute indifference of the foreign policy establishment of the United States to the international drug traffic. Practices by friendly governments which would have been regarded as utterly intolerable had they extended to some recognizably political field, or had they been deleterious to the interests of well being of a more visible class of people—people, to be blunt, known to the foreign policy establishment—such practices would have had the gravest and most immediate consequences for the practicioners. But so long as the only people being destroyed were far away and relatively invisible, these practices continued with barely the mildest demur. Nothing, it seems to me, has changed more dramatically since the advent of the present administration. President Nixon has made the control of the international drug traffic a specific object of American foreign policy. It is long past time some President did.

It is similarly past time we began to think about drug education in the terms of persons who seriously wish to educate. Telling children that something is dangerous, that is to say that adults don't like it, is at least as likely to attract as to repel them. We need to forget about the way we have approached these subjects in the past—look how we have failed!—and to learn what really are the approaches—the arrangements of fact, if you will—that will in fact affect conduct.

But above all we must provide an alternative.

It is as simple and as complex as that. A society in which people do not need drugs. In which the young are not afraid to grow up. In which the poor are not more interested in death than life. In which the colors of the city-scape and the countryside are so much more beautiful than anything to be attained by hallucinogenic chemicals that the use of them seems counterfeit simply because it will be counterfeit: an experience that does not reward but cheats.

What kind of society is that? I think we all know. I think we had better get on with building it.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.
Price 5 cents (single copy). Subscription Price: $2.50 per year; $3.25 additional for foreign mailing.
☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1969 393/216/S-23

69